

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON

DAVID DAVINCI, et al,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF MISSOURI, et al,

Defendants.

No. CV06-68-AS

OPINION AND ORDER

**MOSMAN, J.,**

On January 17, 2006, plaintiffs filed a complaint against the State of Oregon, Rob Brunner, Michael Pead, Hardy Myers, and Ted Kulongoski alleging the Oregon defendants denied them legal protections during the course of an investigation of possible securities fraud conducted by the Oregon Department of Consumer and Business Services ("DCBS"). Magistrate Judge Ashmanskas recommended granting defendant's motion (#17) to dismiss on the ground that this court lacks subject matter jurisdiction and plaintiffs failed to file a claim upon which relief can be granted. On May 30, 2006, this court entered an order (#22) adopting without modification the Findings and Recommendation (#19) GRANTING defendant's motion (#17) to dismiss. On May 31, 2006, the court entered a judgment (#23) dismissing this case with prejudice.

Currently before the court are four motions for reconsideration (#24, #25, #26, #27) filed by plaintiffs. A motion for reconsideration must demonstrate, by setting forth "facts or law of a strongly convincing nature," some reason why the court should reconsider its decision. *U.S. v.*

*\$39,663.00 in U.S. Currency*, 971 F. Supp. 486, 487 (D. Or. 1997). "Courts have distilled three major grounds justifying reconsideration: 1) an intervening change in controlling law; 2) the availability of new evidence; and 3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice."

*Id.* Plaintiffs fail to set forth facts or law that persuade the court to reconsider its prior decision.

Therefore, the motions (#24, #25, #26, #27) to reconsider are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 15th day of June, 2006.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
United States District Court